

Appln. No. 10/767,562
Amendment
Reply to Office Action dated June 28, 2005

Docket No. 304-820

AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS

Replacement Figure 1 is attached hereto, which includes the claimed features as requested by the Examiner. No new matter is added.

Attachment: One replacement sheet

{WP269401;1}

Appn. No. 10/484,940
Amendment
Reply to Office Action dated July 1, 2005

Docket No. 304-822

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are in response to the Office Action dated June 28, 2005. This amendment is filed with a Request for Retroactive Extension of Time and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0951 for the appropriate fees.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-11 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, objections were raised to the drawings and specification. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 2-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The objections and rejections are discussed in more detail below.

I. Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR §1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Office Action required the MOSFETs, the gate control voltage, the control means, the evaluation means, and the turns in the sensor to be shown in the drawings. A revised Fig. 1 is enclosed, which duly shows the requested features. The control means and the evaluation means are combined in the circuit 13. The sensor is drawn with only one turn as this is how the sensor is manufactured in reality. Withdrawal of all the drawing objections is respectfully requested.

II. Objections to the Specification

The disclosure was objected to because it makes an improper reference to claim 1 in paragraph [0005]. Appropriate corrections have been made, and withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections on Art

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,642,711 to Kawate et al. ("Kawate"). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,724,198 to Hohl. Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,512,370

Appln. No. 10/767,562

Docket No. 304-820

Amendment

Reply to Office Action dated June 28, 2005

to James. Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,971 to Smolenski et al ("Smolenski"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,324 to Uber, III et al. ("Uber"). Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate in view of Uber as applied, and further view of James. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawate and Uber as applied to claim, and further in view of Smolenski. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant notes that in Kawate, there are clearly two MOSFETs provided for one sensor. Claim 1 is amended herein to recite "wherein said switching means comprise a single MOSFET with one low drain-source resistor per said sensor" to further differentiate the differences between the claimed arrangement and that of Kawate. Such an arrangement is not taught or suggested by Kawate, and claim 1 is thus believed to be in condition for allowance.

In the rejection of claim 2, the Office Action refers to Hohl. This prior art reference discloses a completely different function for a circuit arrangement for inductively operating sensors. A person skilled in the art would not have combined the two different circuit principles of Kawate and Hohl, especially because the circuit arrangement of Kawate could obviously not work with only one MOSFET per sensor. The same applies to the rejection of claims 3 to 5 with the further prior art document of James. The resonant circuit capacitor of James is for a completely different purpose and a person skilled in the art would not have found any teaching or suggestion in either James or Hohl to combine such an arrangement with Kawate to arrive at the features of the claims. A similar argumentation applies to the other prior art documents Smolenski and Uber.

The Office Action does not give any argumentation as to how a person skilled in the art could have combined the prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention according to one of the claims. This can be shown, for example, with reference to James. This prior art document discloses a so-called Pi-regulator, which characterizes a certain type of regulator. This means that capacitors C1 and C2 have to have the same properties with the same capacity. This can also be taken from column 5, lines 8 to 10. Such a limitation is not necessary for the invention defined in the present claims, but would have caused the person of ordinary skill in the art to realize that the

Appln. No. 10/767,562
Amendment
Reply to Office Action dated June 28, 2005

Docket No. 304-820

capacitors of James could not be simply combined with the teaching of Kawate (for example) with any reasonable expectation of success. Similar arguments apply with respect to the other combinations listed in the Office Action, and Applicant believes that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made. If the Examiner wishes to maintain the rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the motivation to combine the prior art documents listed be set out clearly.

For the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is believed in condition for allowance. The dependent claims are also believed allowable, because of their dependence upon an allowable base claim, and because of the further features recited. A new claim 12 is added herein, which combines the features of former claim 1, claim 2 and claim 11, and is also believed in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is thus believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Rodman Steele, Jr.
Registration No. 25,931
Sarah E. Smith
Registration No. 50,488
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

Date: 11/28/05

Docket No. 304-820